LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

Battle of Scarborough

Notes of the Month by R.P.D.

★

Case against Nuclear Arms

by Jim Mortimer

★

Nationalisation of Insurance

by Frank Crump, General Secretary of the National Amalgamated Union of Life Assurance Workers

THE SIEGE OF St. PANCRAS
Don Cook, tenants' leader

U.S. ELECTIONS
Herbert Aptheker

SEAMEN'S STRUGGLES
George Hardy recalls the Union in the 'twenties

MY FIRST STRIKE
Don McLaren, engineering apprentice

OCTOBER · 1960

One Shilling and Sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN THE THICK OF IT

'MY CONSTITUENCY Labour Party discussed last night what is the practical and realistic way to throw out the Tories and get a Labour Government in power,' writes a *North West* reader. 'I say that a bold declaration of war on the Tories, promising to disarm and clear out the U.S. occupying forces, while nationalising the key industries would win the next election by an overwhelming majority. But how can you get unity in the Party with extreme right wing leaders who Squint-Both-Ways, and are after something quite different?' If delegates to conferences all consisted of fellow *Labour Monthly* readers, his policy would be carried unanimously; and then what a campaign this country would see! No need for pathetic racking of brains looking round for 'a Leader'. We should find and make leaders everywhere. Look at what is already happening in different sectors of the battle front today: the Long Peace March, the Notice to Quit U.S. bases, the tremendous victories in trade union conferences; tenants associations springing up apparently overnight, from the dragon's teeth sown by the 1957 Rent Act and the Government's Help-the-Landlords policy; the seamen standing out for elementary rights; engineers a-stir, young and old; railwaymen and miners keen to resist attack A wealth of initiative and leadership here, in different sections each impatient to get a move on with all the enthusiasm and confidence of working together, united in aim. It is no accident that in the pages following the *Notes of the Month* the articles are all from people in the thick of the fight. There is Don Cook, describing *The Siege of St. Pancras* from his barricaded flat, which sparked off the biggest national rents protest yet seen. A veteran seamen's leader, George Hardy, vividly recalls the lessons of past betrayals; whilst at the opposite end of the age scale, an engineering apprentices' leader, Don McLaren, describes *My First Strike*. Another young reader gives a picture of the prospect of *Looking For Jobs*, and a London railwayman has a go at *The Great Trains Robbery*. Again, following the two immensely important—and much studied—articles on the coal industry by the present miners' General Secretary, Will Paynter, and his predecessor, Arthur Horner, this month we have a third General Secretary, Frank Crump, presenting the case for the long overdue *Nationalisation of Insurance*, one of the most important sectors of the economy.

And the over-riding question of peace? I don't think it would be easy to find a more thorough and informative account of *The Case Against Nuclear Weapons* than Jim Mortimer presents, after a close study on the spot of events at the Trades Union Congress. Then delegates to Scarborough, 1960, might well note the unique *Reminder* by Roland Casasola, before his retirement president of the Foundryworkers and Labour Party Executive member, of the Conference at Scarborough, 1954. There he moved the resolution opposing German Rearmament, only defeated by the narrowest margin—and the much disputed delegation vote of a single union. Ranged against to sway that Conference, were the redoubtable leading figures of Clement Attlee, the late Arthur Deakin, Herbert Morrison. If that resolution had been carried six years ago, what a difference today, says Casasola, in a moving plea to this year's Scarborough delegates.

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

BATTLE OF SCARBOROUGH

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide.

Uncle Ebenezer's Collection of Favourite Corn of the Old Labour Movement.

THIS time it really is a moment to decide. Everything, not merely of Labour's future, but of Britain's future—and indeed, in no insignificant degree, of the future of peace in the world—comes on the anvil of decision at Scarborough this October. Will Scarborough decide? Will Scarborough reach firm decisions to end and close for ever the accursed past decade of cold war and Labour defeats and enter on a new era of triumphant advance in harmony with the advance of socialism and liberation throughout the world? Or will the crooks and tricksters, the architects of defeat, the purveyors of poison through the megaphone columns of Mammon's press, get their way once again to drag down Labour's banner still deeper in the mud? One thing is certain. Every device will be attempted to prevent the clear expression of the declared will of the majority of the organised working class. We saw the methods over German rearmament—with disastrous consequences now admitted even by the authors of the stratagem. We have seen the same

CONTENTS

Vol. XLII OCTOBER · 1960

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: *Battle of Scarborough,* by R.P.D. ...	433
LABOUR PARTY AND LABOUR MONTHLY, A Misconception Corrected	447
THE CASE AGAINST NUCLEAR WEAPONS, by J. E. Mortimer	449
THE U.S. ELECTIONS, by Herbert Aptheker	453
NATIONALISATION OF INSURANCE, by Frank Crump	460
SEAMEN'S STRUGGLES, by George Hardy	464
MY FIRST STRIKE, by Don McLaren	467
VIEWS OF THE WORLD, by Roland Casasola; George Thomson; Frank McKenna; John Delahoy	469
THE SIEGE OF ST. PANCRAS, by Don Cook	475
A PIONEER MARXIST HISTORIAN, by N. Hannaford	478
Book Review:	
Out of Apathy, Edited by E. P. Thompson: *D. Nandy* ...	479

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

methods at the Douglas Trades Union Congress last month when the overwhelming victorious majority against nuclear strategy, which could no longer be prevented, was sullied and confused and turned into a public mock by the simultaneous false majority for the opposite policy. This time every working class fighter and honest delegate needs to be on guard. All the tricks will be tried. These past-masters of electoral defeat will try to smuggle through their policies in the name of electoral necessity. These experts of disruption, of the witch-hunt and expulsion of militants, will plead for 'unity' to accept their minority policies. We have had enough. It is time for a change. It is time to move forward. The delegates to Scarborough have the chance to lead the way.

1. *Why this crisis?*

What is it all about? Is it really only a battle of leaders? Of Gaitskell versus Cousins? Rubbish. Every one knows that deep issues of policy, class issues, are involved. The opposing policies are expressed by spokesmen of the opposing classes within the uneasy coalition form of the Labour Party. Is it really a battle of 'hoary traditionalists' clinging to 'obsolete shibboleths' about the 'common ownership of the means of production' against the bright and breezy salesmen of 'modern realities' of the 'new capitalism' who wish to project a 'modern up-to-date image' (in their characteristic showmen's jargon) of *Labour in the Sixties*? Rubbish again. Every one is (happily or gloomily) aware that the era of the Sixties is the era of the most victorious advance yet known of socialism (real socialism, social ownership of the means of production, not phrasemaking) outstripping capitalism by the admission of the capitalists themselves in sphere after sphere, the era of the accelerating transition from capitalism to socialism throughout the world. Or is it a battle of starry-eyed 'pacifism' against sturdy apostles of Britain's 'defence'? Super-rubbish this time; for the official White Paper of nuclear strategy has emphasised that there is no question in a nuclear war of the defence of Britain, but that the plan is to use Britain as a launching base and for this purpose the strategy is to try to defend the bases, not the population. All these parrot phrases to confuse the real controversies are only the familiar conjuror's tricks to gull the unwary. For the real issues which find expression at this moment in the present controversies it is necessary to look a little deeper.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Crisis of Western Social Democracy

The present crisis of the Labour Party is in fact the crisis of all modern social democracy in all the countries of imperialism. The greater sharpness of the battle in the Labour Party is the reflection of the special character and trade union basis of the Labour Party. All these parties made their promises at the end of the second world war to offer their alternative non-communist supposed 'democratic' path to socialism. All these promises have ended in admitted failure in every case, in the strengthened entrenchment of capitalist monopoly, and in the political domination of reaction in the leading countries of Western Europe, as in Britain, France and Western Germany. Therefore these parties are compelled today to choose between two alternatives. Either to go forward to the real fight for socialism, the class fight, in unity with the Communists, on the basis of working class unity leading the majority of the people against monopoly capitalism. Or to abandon publicly and repudiate the aim of socialism, formally adopt the gospel of private capitalist enterprise and competition as the foundation of 'freedom', and denounce social ownership as a 'totalitarian' conception and the negation of 'freedom' (as in the new German Social Democratic Programme).

Trade Unions and Socialism

In the German, Austrian, Swedish and other social democratic parties this revisionist transformation of the programme has gone through with relative ease. But in Britain the same revisionist leadership have found themselves thwarted in their endeavours to carry through the same transformation of the programme because the opposition of the socialists among the individual members has been reinforced by the opposition of the main body of the trade unions, who most of them have nationalisation at least of their own industry inscribed in their constitutions or union programmes and who have the decisive voting strength at the Conference. Thus an extraordinary and significant situation has been reached. Originally the Labour Party was founded sixty years ago by the handful of socialist pioneers building an alliance with the trade unions, which were still suspicious of socialism and traditionally followed the Liberal Party, to draw them into the beginnings of independent political activity in the hope of later winning them for socialism. Today a stage has been reached when the leadership of the Labour Party conducts the fight against socialism, while

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is the mass of the workers in the trade unions who stand in the forefront of the fight for the aim of socialism. This is a measure of the advance of the political consciousness of the working class. The Labour Party is at once the largest and leading party of modern social democracy and the central battleground of the fight for or against socialism within its ranks.

Who Killed Cock Robin?

In Britain the deeper root of the present battle is the responsibility for the destruction of the 1945 victory. Who killed the mass enthusiasm of 1945 which swept Labour to victory and Toryism to rout? Who is responsible for the extending series of Labour defeats and Tory victories for the past decade? What must be done to change the course? This is the common starting point on both sides. Logic would say: the dominant leadership and policies must bear the responsibility for the ruin they have caused. That is, the right-wing leadership and policies, represented by Attlee and Bevin yesterday or Gaitskell and his colleagues today. But these representatives have the insolence to proclaim that the only cure is to supply more of their poison which has already struck down the victim. They blame socialism. They blame nationalisation. They blame the class basis of the Labour Party. They blame the trade unions. They blame everything and everyone but themselves. They blame everything that has ever brought Labour electoral victory, and whose betrayal has always brought Labour electoral defeat. They dare to pose as accusers, when they should be in the dock.

Look On This Picture...

The lesson of these fifteen years must be learned. In 1945 Labour swept to power in an unparallelled victory. On what basis? Was it on the basis of the mild 'moderate' liberal-capitalist cold-war anti-Soviet pro-American nuclear strategy programme now advocated by the revisionists? Not on your life. Labour swept to power in the mighty mass upsurge following the joint victory over fascism, mass enthusiasm for the Soviet Union and Soviet victories as socialist victories, hatred of Toryism and fascism and German militarism, demand for a basic social transformation in the direction of socialism. Labour won its unprecedented majority on an electoral programme promising peace and close co-operation with the Soviet Union, destruction of German militarism, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

large-scale nationalisation (the last forced into the programme by the 1944 Conference against the wishes of the leadership who declared it would mean electoral defeat). Such was the programme of electoral victory.

...And On That

What followed? The Attlee-Bevin leadership proceeded to embark on a programme of vicious anti-Soviet hostility from the outset, the cold war, surrender of Britain to the United States, construction of the atom bomb (this last without even consulting the Cabinet).* American bomber bases in Britain, colonial wars, N.A.T.O., the rebuilding of German militarism, and colossal re-armament. When the bill for all this resulted in austerity, the reversal of social reforms and the wage freeze, the previous mass enthusiasm gave place to mass disillusionment. On this basis, not through their own virtues, the previously discredited Tories were able to creep back. This was the murder of the mass upsurge and enthusiasm of 1945, the same mass upsurge and enthusiasm that has led to the sweeping advance of socialist victories and socialist construction in Eastern Europe. It was this murder by social democracy (allied to U.S. capitalism) in Western Europe that has led to what all the political commentators have agreed in describing as the general 'political apathy' of the fifties and advance of reaction (de Gaulle, Adenauer, Macmillan) in Western Europe. This is the glaring lesson of the past decade and a half which now confronts Scarborough to make the Sixties a new decade of advance.

A Healthy Revolt

Scarborough has the opportunity to deliver the verdict and draw the necessary political conclusions for the future. So far as the dominant leadership is concerned, they have sunk deeper and deeper, dragging down the Labour Party with them. The immediate demand of the rank and file after 1951 for a radical change and a positive programme was choked and suffocated by the outpourings of the tiny handful of academic 'new thinkers' singing

*'I was Minister of Defence in 1950 but knew nothing of how the decision to manufacture the atom bomb was reached. Only recently, as a result of my investigations, did I discover that the decision to undertake research and development was taken in 1947 in consultation with a few of my Government colleagues. So far as I am aware the subject was never mentioned at any of the Cabinet meetings. And apart from the Minister of Defence, A. V. Alexander, who held the post in 1947, none of the other Service Ministers was taken into confidence. In his own book Earl Attlee omits any reference to the subject and gives no details of how this momentous decision came to be made' (Emanuel Shinwell, 'The Anatomy of Leadership', *Sunday Times*, September 18, 1960).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the praises of the 'new capitalism' and churning out an unreadable (and unread) series of verbose policy pamphlets which never touched a single one of the burning issues of our epoch or aroused one iota of response from the masses. The erection of the dreary economics lecturer Gaitskell to the leadership in 1956 represented the enthronement of the academic 'new thinkers' clique, who dream of vivisecting the Labour Party to make a pretty little new Liberal Party after their hearts' desire. At each successive election of the fifties this leadership tailed further behind Toryism (thus performing their one political miracle of presenting a hat trick of increasing Tory majorities to a continuous Tory Government), preaching their gospel of the cold war, the H-bomb and N.A.T.O., and appearing as the most envenomed anti-Soviet spitfires (the Brown-Bevan scandal at the Khrushchov dinner), while the Tories were able to waltz away at each successive election (1950, 1955 and 1959) with a show of conciliatory gestures to the Soviet Union and proposals for a Summit. It is no wonder that the revolt of the Labour Party and trade union membership has arisen to make an end of this suicidal idiocy and to change the course. And it is correct that this revolt has fastened on the two key issues. First, opposition to the H-bomb and nuclear strategy. Second, the demand for far-reaching measures against the monopolies to extend social ownership and advance towards the clearly proclaimed aim of socialism. The lines of fight are drawn.

2. *Nuclear Disarmament*

Three major issues in fact come before the Labour Party Conference at Scarborough. The first is the question of peace and nuclear disarmament. The second is the question of the aim of socialism and Clause 4. The third may not arise for final settlement at this Conference, although a number of resolutions from local parties do raise it: but it has already been widely presented by the Executive majority and the capitalist press as the way of escape in the event of defeat on a vital policy. This is the question of the relationship of the Labour Party Conference and the Parliamentary Labour Party; whether the democratically elected Conference shall be sovereign, or whether the M.P.s shall be a law unto themselves. All these issues have been widely discussed before the Conference. A few final points may be suggested for consideration.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Peace and Nuclear Disarmament

Peace and Nuclear Disarmament is justly the most important issue before the Conference; for it is at this moment the most important issue before mankind. It is also the heart of all Britain's problems, including home economic problems and the aim of socialism. When George Brown declared on September 3 that this question is 'not fundamental to socialism', he was not only revealing that typical blinkered parochial distortion of socialism which has always been the curse of the so-called 'British School of Socialism' (actually 'imperialist school of distortion of socialism'). He was also revealing that terrifying blindness to the concrete realities of the modern world which is characteristic of the abstract right-wing theorists (just as the Fabians in 1914 admitted they had never paid attention to 'international affairs'). The international socialist movement has a long record in the fight for peace and has always linked closely the aims of peace and socialism. In the age of nuclear weapons, when at the same time the strength of socialism over one third of the world, together with the newly independent nations and the peoples everywhere can defeat the menace of a nuclear war, this question has taken on a new urgency. It is the paramount question of the present moment. Therefore it is right that, thanks to the over 160 resolutions of trade unions and local parties on the agenda, and the previous flood of decisions of union conferences and the vote of the T.U.C., this question will take first place in the proceedings of the Labour Party Conference.

Why Unilateral?

In Britain the fight against nuclear weapons has taken the special form of the demand for Britain's immediate unilateral nuclear disarmament in advance of the universally agreed aim of a general international ban on nuclear weapons. This demand, originally voiced in respect of the H-bomb by the Communist Party Election Manifesto in 1955, has since been taken up by an extending range of trade union, democratic and peace organisations, and has been actively furthered in the recent period by the united Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, founded in 1958. It has now been adopted by a majority of over a million at the Trades Union Congress last month (not using the term 'unilateral', but specifying 'complete rejection of any defence policy based on the threat of the use of strategic or tactical nuclear weapons'), and has a mandated majority for the Labour Party Conference. This demand corresponds to the special conditions of Britain, which is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not a major nuclear power, but only a junior partner of American nuclear power, with the British H-bomb an estimated mere token 3 per cent of the Anglo-American H-bomb, and with Britain's practical role as the main American nuclear launching base. Hence for the United States and the Soviet Union, confronting each other with full nuclear power, nuclear disarmament will need to be mutual, since any proposal for unilateral disarmament in the case of these two countries could only be advocated on grounds of pure pacifism. But in the case of Britain the proposal for unilateral nuclear disarmament is in fact not, as its enemies pretend, a heroic moral gesture of pure pacifism (though its fulfilment can assist the general fight for an international ban on nuclear weapons) but a prudent, practical business-like gesture, supported equally by pacifists and non-pacifists, to save Britain from the menace of being the main American nuclear launching base and destined first victim in a nuclear war.

For the Defence of Britain

Thus the proposal for unilateral nuclear disarmament is a proposal for the better defence of Britain. All the arguments about 'defence' versus 'pacifism', 'would you leave Britain defenceless?' are irrelevant. They miss the main point about the H-bomb and Britain. Britain is in deadly danger at present precisely because the H-bomb is based on Britain, because Britain is at present the main American or American-controlled N.A.T.O. nuclear launching base, and therefore inevitably the main immediate target for destruction in a nuclear war. It is no use trying to find consolation in the promise of 'consultation' or 'joint decision' before use (a ten seconds telephone call to the Premier in a moment of hysteria and false reports such as launched the Korean war). For the U.S. Strategic Air Command has always publicly maintained and maintains its absolute sovereign unshared unilateral right to launch nuclear war at any moment it may choose from any base under its direct control, and in that event Britain by its alliance commitments would be automatically drawn in, irrespective of consultation. Only unilateral nuclear disarmament and the clearing out of the American bases can save Britain from this menace, which is the main menace threatening Britain today.

'Menace of Soviet Aggression'

But what of the 'menace of Soviet aggression?' 'Can you trust the Russians?' It is not a question of 'trusting the Russians'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—even though every statesman and military expert has by now publicly recognised that Soviet policy is entirely for peace. The short answer to this favourite poser is that Britain is already 'trusting the Russians'. For Britain is already completely defenceless before Soviet rockets, which, as the official arguments for abandoning Blue Streak admitted, could wipe out every base in Britain in ten minutes without any possibility of resistance. The argument is indeed remarkably like that preceding N.A.T.O. Then it was declared that the wicked Kremlin rulers could overrun defenceless Western Europe in a couple of days with their hordes, and were bent on doing so, but that when N.A.T.O. had built up 30, 50 or 70 divisions in three years', or five years', or seven years' time, Western Europe could be defended, and every sacrifice was justified for this great aim. And meanwhile? During the three, five or seven years? The implicit assumption was that the Russians would be too gentlemanly to violate the rules of cricket by attacking before they were quite sure the enemy was ready to repulse them. So now the Government assures us that Britain will be at the mercy of the Soviet Union, which can wipe out every present base, unless Britain gets Skybolt at a large dollar cost by 1964 or possibly 1965. And meanwhile? The pretended official theory that meanwhile perhaps the old bombers may get through deceives no one after the bringing down of the U-2 at 68,000 feet with the first rocket. But no one is worried. Mr. Macmillan, Mr. Strachey and the rest all snore away peacefully without anxiety in their beds. Because they all know that the official handouts about the 'menace of Soviet aggression' are poppycock for the gallery (or, shall we rather say, for the stalls?) to cover very different designs behind N.A.T.O. and the nuclear strategy.

Menace of Whose Aggression?

The real menace of aggression is rather different, as the whole record of wars of the past fifteen years, in Greece, Malaya, Indonesia, China, Korea, Vietnam, Yemen, Suez and Algeria has shown. It was the West that first dropped the needless atom bombs, when Japan was suing for peace (as the publication of the official American records has now admitted). It is the West that for fifteen years has resisted and resists, under a hundred ever-changing pretexts, every Soviet proposal for the banning and destruction of all nuclear weapons. Why? For defence? The H-bomb is not a weapon for defence. It is an offensive weapon, for infinite in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discriminate slaughter of distant peoples. But, we are assured, we need the H-bomb only as 'a deterrent' to prevent aggression. Every strategist knows that the 'deterrent' theory is a pretty deception to gull the innocent. The 'deterrent' theory means that if the enemy strikes you with an H-bomb, you will strike back, and this knowledge will 'deter' him. But this is not the strategic theory of the West. The Western strategists suspect that if you wait to use the H-bomb until the other side has used it you will not be there to use it. Therefore the official U.S. and N.A.T.O. nuclear strategy is to 'Strike First' with nuclear weapons even though the other side does not use them. The pitiful attempt of the Labour 'Defence Statement' to cover up this awkward fact by promising that if in power they will beg the United States to change this policy does not make one atom of difference to the actual present fact so long as they accept in practice the present N.A.T.O. and the present N.A.T.O. strategy.

'Strike First'

But, we are assured for final consolation, this official 'Strike First' nuclear strategy of the West against an enemy not using nuclear weapons is not really so dangerous, because it will only be used against a serious 'aggression'. And what will be regarded as an 'aggression?' Every attempt to secure an answer to this question has failed equally in London and Washington. The Soviet draft for an internationally agreed definition of 'aggression' has been resisted by the West. When and under what conditions will the N.A.T.O. nuclear strategy come into operation? That is a State secret, Congressional committees have been informed when the question has been pressed. But Secretary of State Dulles made clear that under 'aggression' they include 'indirect aggression' or 'subversion', which can mean either a revolution anywhere or, as has been further made clear by American official statements, an elected Government with Communist representatives. So the chances of the use of nuclear weapons by the West, if we let them get away with it, are quite rosy, according to their official doctrine, beneath all their bland innocent pretence of 'only defensive'.

Liberation of Britain

This is the real menace against which we need defence. The first essential practical measure which the British people can now take for their defence from this menace is to free Britain from the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deadly bonds of this nuclear strategy, N.A.T.O. and the American bases, as the initial step to winning by the will of the peoples of the world the international prohibition and destruction of all nuclear weapons and all weapons of mass destruction. Towards this objective Scarborough has the unique opportunity, without parallel in the history of the Labour movement, to lead the way for the survival and future of the whole British people.

3. *Socialism and Clause 4*

On the second great question before the Scarborough Conference, the question of the aim of socialism as set out in Clause 4 of the Constitution, over which the loudest noise of controversy arose in the earlier part of the year, the issue in principle has already in fact been settled, as the T.U.C. unanimous resolution has shown. The overwhelming unanimity of the entire working class and socialist movement has resisted the attempt of Mr. Gaitskell to delete the 'common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange', as set out in Clause 4 Point 4, from the Constitution. The executive has had to carry out retreat after retreat. But the battle is not over. While nominally leaving Clause 4, the revisionists are still trying to smuggle through the same objective in a hundred alternative forms. The sharpest vigilance of the Conference will be necessary to stop the smugglers from getting away with their booty. For this reason it may be worth while to say a few words on the various manoeuvres which are being attempted.

Why Now?

Why has this battle arisen over Clause 4 forty-two years after its adoption? When it was originally adopted in 1918, under the influence of the victorious Bolshevik Revolution, it was inserted by the right-wing leadership in the new Constitution as a means of appeasing the left-wing revolt with a formula, while leaving the practice unchanged. Since that time, for over four decades, while enabling idealists and utopians to point to this clause as proof of their belief in the Labour Party as a socialist party, despite its capitalist practice, this formula has always been ignored in practice by the leadership and regarded much as the Church of England regards the Sermon on the Mount. But in 1960 the slumbers have been broken and the issue of this formula has suddenly become a burning issue. Why?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moment of Awakening

The answer is evident in the situation. The conspicuous bankruptcy of reformist policy, exposed in the fall of the Labour Government and the subsequent increasing electoral defeats, has inevitably led to a demand in the trade union and Labour Party organisations for a basic change of policy in a socialist direction, in the sense of the demand that a Government based on the organised working class should take over or nationalise the main sectors of economy out of the hands of the monopolists. To head off this demand, the right-wing revisionist leaders, with Gaitskell as their spokesman, launched their offensive at the Blackpool Conference at the end of 1959, immediately after their electoral defeat, to propose the removal of the aim of socialism from the constitution and the replacement of Clause 4 by a new liberal programme. The irony of the situation is that this counter-revolutionary offensive has produced the opposite effect. Previously Clause 4 slumbered in peace. Now for the first time in the sixty years of the Labour Party the issue of the aim of socialism has become the central burning issue of controversy from top to bottom of the party. This will indeed be a historic moment if at the Scarborough Conference the battle for the aim of socialism—no longer as a shibboleth to receive pious assent and be ignored, but as a programme to be accepted or rejected—is for the first time fought and won.

Successive Manoeuvres

But the battle is not yet won. The direct offensive to delete the old Clause 4 and replace it by Twelve Points of wishy-washy liberal platitudes and the 'mixed' (capitalist) economy was attempted by Gaitskell in the Executive early this year and adopted in March for presentation to the Conference. Universal opposition compelled the withdrawal of this proposal. But since then a bewildering variety of alternative formulations for the same revisionist objective has been tried out in the hope of fooling the Conference to pass one of them by inadvertence. The second attempt was to retain Clause 4, but 'amplify' and 'clarify' it by Mr. Gaitskell's Twelve Points as a restatement 'adopted in 1960'. This new version was adopted by the obedient Executive majority in May. Once again it had to be abandoned in face of mass opposition. By June the third version was tried and adopted by the obedient Executive majority.

> The national executive resolves not to proceed with any amendment of or addition to Clause 4 of the constitution, but declares the statement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> which it adopted on March 16 is an invaluable expression of the aims of the Labour Party in the second half of the twentieth century and commends it to conference accordingly.

The trick is barefaced. If this apparently anodyne statement were allowed to slip through without rejection by the Conference, we are back where we were and the Gaitskell Twelve Points will be declared to have been accepted as 'the aims of the Labour Party in the second half of the twentieth century'. *Caveat emptor,* as the law says. Let the buyer beware.

'Labour in the Sixties'

One final manoeuvre has been added for good measure. In July the by now bewildered Executive had before it yet one more document of Labour's aims entitled *Labour in the Sixties.* This pamphlet, the General Secretary announced in his Newsletter of August, 'may well turn out to be one of the most significant milestones along the Party's road forward'. High praise from a quarter well placed to judge, since the pamphlet was by the General Secretary. This pamphlet sought to sidestep the dangerous problem by inserting frequently the phrase 'socialism', 'our socialist faith', 'a socialist victory' without ever defining what socialism is; promising two future reports some day on 'domestic and foreign affairs'; and meanwhile presenting the usual revisionist hotch-potch ending in a characteristic liberal reform programme for measures for (*a*) location of industry; (*b*) transport reorganisation; (*c*) educational reform; (*d*) social services improvement; (*e*) extended capital investment and industrial development. Organisational proposals follow at the end. The Executive, more cunning this time, did not adopt the document as its own, but put out the statement:

> *Labour in the Sixties* was prepared by the General Secretary on the instructions of the N.E.C. The N.E.C. commends this Report to Annual Conference and will seek approval for the action points it contains.

This strategem is once again barefaced. Who can object to the anodyne phrase 'commends to the Annual Conference'? Once this slips by unchallenged, the new document *Labour in the Sixties* can be declared to be the current statement of Labour's aims approved by the Conference (if the Twelve Points have failed to get through as 'an invaluable expression of Labour's aims'), to be followed by the two Reports in the bag—and Clause 4 is safely back on the shelf. In vain the net is spread in the sight of the bird. But the delegates to Scarborough will certainly need to get up early in the morning and be vigilant in the extreme if the man-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

date of their organisations for the aim of the common ownership of the means of production, as set out in Clause 4, and for an immediate programme of extended nationalisation, is to be made effective.

Scarborough's Chance

Delegates to Scarborough have indeed a big chance; and the hearts and minds of trade unionists and socialists and peace supporters all over the country are with them. If they can defeat the manoeuvres of confusion and carry through the majority mandates already entrusted to them by their organisations; if they can win the day for Britain's repudiation of nuclear weapons and nuclear strategy; if they can win the day for the plain aim of socialism, of common ownership, against the rule of the monopolies: then indeed they will have prepared the way to resume the advance which has been interrupted; they will have prepared the way to move in harmony with the advance of socialism throughout the world; they will have prepared the way for the real advance of Labour in the Sixties.

September 20, 1960. R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

A LIE NAILED

It declares that the main slogan in the sphere of activity against war is the struggle for peace. This destroys—at least we hope it will—the *canard* that the Communists want war because it brings revolution. The Communists are not interested in fomenting war, but are vitally interested in preserving peace.

(*The Seventh Congress of the Communist International,* by Harry Pollitt, October, 1935.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour Party and Labour Monthly

A Misconception Corrected

IN publishing an extract from Arthur Horner's article 'Coal; What Future?' which appeared in our September number, the *Daily Telegraph* referred to our journal as 'proscribed by the Labour Party'. A letter was accordingly sent to the *Daily Telegraph* to request that this misconception be corrected. The News Editor, after consulting with Labour Party Headquarters, has replied, apologising for the error, and a correction has accordingly been published in the *Daily Telegraph* of September 1. For the information of our readers we print the correspondence.

Extract from Daily Telegraph, *August 27, 1960:*

In an article in *Labour Monthly,* which is proscribed by the Labour Party, Mr. Horner says . . .

Letter from the Editor of Labour Monthly *to the Editor of the Daily Telegraph, August 29, 1960:*

Sir,

May I correct an inadvertent error which has crept into your citation from *Labour Monthly* in your issue of August 27. You state that *Labour Monthly* is 'proscribed by the Labour Party'. The list of Labour Party proscriptions is given in the last Report on Page 178, and does not include *Labour Monthly.* Over our 40 years of existence we have been happy to print contributions from such leading figures in the Labour and Trade Union movement as Aneurin Bevan, Citrine, Shinwell, Lansbury, Crossman, Strachey, Shaw, Laski, Cole, Brailsford, Sir Stafford Cripps, Fred Henderson, Joe Reeves, A. J. Cook, Will Lawther, W. H. Hutchinson, Gavin Martin, Harry Brotherton, Jack Tanner, Sir Richard Coppock and many Labour Members of Parliament, Trade Union General Secretaries and local Labour Councillors. It is possible that some sections in the Labour Party may disagree with what our contributors say just as others may agree; but this is no ground for interference.

Our main sales circulation, which runs into five figures, and is, possibly, the widest of any political monthly in the Labour movement, or indeed among many serious political monthlies, although we have no advantage of subsidies or financing by a publishing house or other organisation, is mainly in the Labour Party and Trade Union movement.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I shall be most grateful if you can publish this slight correction of a misconception which could otherwise be harmful to our journal.

Yours faithfully,

R. PALME DUTT,
Editor.

Letter from the News Editor of the Daily Telegraph *to the Editor of* Labour Monthly, *September 1, 1960:*

Dear Mr. Palme Dutt,

You would notice that we published a correction this morning following your letter addressed to the Editor.

I'm sorry about the error, but I ought to say that the reporter concerned checked with Transport House before writing his story! Transport House pleaded guilty when we challenged them yesterday.

Yours sincerely,

A. MCLAREN,
News Editor.

Correction in Daily Telegraph, *September 1, 1960:*

The journal *Labour Monthly* is not on the Labour Party's list of proscribed organisations as was inadvertently stated on Saturday, a party spokesman said yesterday.

MONICA WHATELY (1891-1960)

We pay tribute to the memory of Monica Whately, well known for her selfless service in progressive causes. She contributed 'The Real Terrorists in Kenya' in Labour Monthly, *January, 1954.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CASE AGAINST NUCLEAR WEAPONS

J. E. Mortimer*

THE passing of the resolution from the Transport and General Workers on world peace and atomic weapons at the recent Trades Union Congress was of great significance for the labour movement. For the first time, unions representing a majority of the affiliated membership supported a resolution which directly challenged the nuclear policy on which NATO strategy is based.

The terms of the resolution deserve more than a summary even in a short article. The full text was as follows.

> This Congress, believing that the great majority of this country are earnestly seeking a lasting peace and recognising that the present state of world tension accentuates the great danger of an accidental drift into war, is convinced that the defence and foreign policies of the future Labour Government should be based upon:
>
> 1. A complete rejection of any defence policy based on the threat of the use of strategic or tactical nuclear weapons.
>
> 2. The permanent cessation of the manufacture or testing of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons.
>
> 3. Patrols of aircraft carrying nuclear weapons and operating from British bases ceasing forthwith.
>
> 4. The continuation of the opposition to the establishment of missile bases in Great Britain.
>
> 5. A strengthening of the United Nations Organisation, including the admission of representatives of the Chinese Peoples Republic, with a view to the creation of a new world order and the avoidance of a return to the methods of the cold war period.
>
> 6. Pressing for the re-opening of discussions between nations at the earliest possible moment as the means by which world disarmament and peaceful co-existence can be most readily achieved.

This resolution was adopted by 4,356,000 votes to 3,213,000, a majority of 1,143,000.

It is true that the joint declaration on foreign policy and defence drawn up by the T.U.C. General Council and the Executive Committee of the Labour Party was also adopted. The voting was 4,150,000 to 3,400,000, giving a majority of 690,000 for the declaration. The circumstances of this voting inconsistency are, of course,

---

*Mr. J. E. Mortimer, as many of our readers well know, is Editor of *The Draughtsman*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already widely known.* The fact that the Transport and General Workers' Union resolution and the joint declaration secured majorities, however, does not mean that they can be reconciled. The Transport and General Workers' Union resolution and the joint declaration are at variance on certain fundamental issues. The majority secured for the Transport and General Workers' Union resolution was the result not only of the pressure of international events but of the activity and discussion which has taken place around the subject of nuclear weapons among the British people, and particularly in the labour movement in recent years.

The supporters of the T. & G.W.U. resolution made a number of main points:

First: nuclear weapons are instruments of human annihilation. Their use in another war would threaten the extinction of the human race. Nuclear war, or the threat to use nuclear weapons cannot, therefore, be regarded as an instrument of policy.

Second: the joint T.U.C.-Labour Party declaration envisages Britain's continuous association with and, indeed, in practice, subordination to the nuclear weapons strategy of the U.S.A. This means that in the event of war Britain would be in the greatest possible danger of becoming an immediate target for nuclear destruction. Such a war might start not so much as the result of deliberate aggression but because of dangerous incidents or provocations with un-premeditated consequences.

Third: that Britain's continuing association with the nuclear weapons strategy of the U.S.A. makes it impossible for us to resist logically the spread of nuclear weapons or foreign bases to every country in the world. We have no right to ask of others what we are not prepared to do ourselves. There is no virtue but only hypocrisy in arguing for a 'non-nuclear club' among others, and simultaneously that Britain should remain tied through NATO to the U.S. nuclear weapons strategy.

If nuclear weapons and/or foreign bases for nuclear weapons are to spread to more and more countries the danger of nuclear war will grow. The world will be at the brink of destruction whenever there is a 'local' incident following tension between even relatively small powers.

Fourth: that Britain's limited resources should be used for the development of her economy, for the improvement of the social services and housing, and for increasing pensions and other insurance benefits, and should not be wasted in support of an arms policy which certainly adds to our danger in the event of war but which cannot provide for the defence of Britain. The money which was spent, for example, on Bluestreak could have commanded resources to build many new hospitals.

Of those who opposed the resolution of the Transport Workers there were significant variations of emphasis. Sir Vincent Tewson argued in reasoned terms and took account of changes in the inter-

*The delegates of the Amalgamated Engineering Union held a meeting and decided by 17 to 16 to cast their vote of nearly a million for both resolutions. This earned for their General Secretary, Mr. William Carron, the nickname of Mr. Facing-Both-Ways from the British press.—Ed., *L.M.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national scene. His speech was not on the familiar theme of the cold war though, in effect, it supported the NATO alliance.

Other speakers—and, in my view, notably Mr. Sam Watson of the National Union of Mineworkers—appeared not to have moved an inch from the position which they adopted some years ago at the height of the cold war. The content of the arguments which they used was that nuclear weapons deter the Russians from aggression. The underlying assumption of this reasoning is, of course, that the Soviet Union would attack Western Europe if it felt that the circumstances were favourable for 'success'.

I was never persuaded that this was a valid interpretation of Soviet policy even when the cold war was at its coldest. Certainly some of the actions of the Soviet Union were unjustifiable—for example, her bitter hostility towards Yugoslavia and the accompanying political and economic sanctions—but they were, in part at least, a reaction to Western policies at that time. The capitalist powers sought to resist fundamental economic changes towards socialism in the countries of Eastern Europe and regarded these changes as though they were examples of Russian aggression. The Russians in turn, sought to mould the East European countries into a monolithic *bloc* to defend the new social order, and regarded almost any kind of difference as a manifestation of imperialist influence, to be stamped out by ruthless means. When full allowance has been given for the wrongs committed during this period, the fact still remains that in the countries of Eastern Europe the old social basis of fascist reaction and militarism was destroyed with the help and support of the Soviet Union. If the Americans had succeeded in their policies the inevitable result would have been restoration of capitalism and reactionary rule throughout Europe.

Today the argument that Soviet policy is aggressive disregards so many features of the present situation that it has become quite unrealistic even to many who have no sympathy with either communism or socialism but who are not blinded by idealogical prejudice. The most obvious fallacy of the argument that the Soviet Union is aggressive is that the U.S.S.R. has far more to gain in peaceful competition than in a war which could bring tremendous destruction. In such circumstances, to maintain that the Soviet leaders are aggressive is to say that they are fools and are incapable of making this kind of calculation. All the evidence points, however, to the fact that they have made this kind of calculation and are determined to do everything possible to maintain peace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover—and this is a particularly important point—it is in the interest of Soviet economic growth to divert resources from arms production to peaceful constructive purposes. With its planned, socialist economy the Soviet Union can ensure that disarmament will lead to better conditions and higher living standards, and not to unemployment. In the capitalist countries, on the other hand, disarmament presents the economic system and the government with a problem of maintaining full employment. To the big firms with a direct interest in arms production, disarmament may well lead to lower profits. It is not for nothing that certain leading share prices on Wall Street tend to move upwards when there is an unfavourable turn in the international situation and when there is talk of more and more arms, missiles and nuclear weapons.

The resolution of the Transport and General Workers' Union provides the framework for a programme which would offer a real effective challenge to the Conservative Government, the cold war and the policies which endanger Britain. Its adoption by the entire labour movement would evoke the kind of enthusiasm among tens of thousands of active rank and file members which could influence the 'marginal' voters. If the Labour Party Conference follows the precedent of the 1960 T.U.C. the first major steps will have been taken to free the British labour movement from its self-destructive adherence to the philosophy of the 'cold war'. This will be of immense significance, not only for the political future of Britain but for the preservation of peace in the world and the development of better relations between East and West.

SELF-PRESERVATION

In regard to bombing from the air, everybody approved of its complete abolition, but Britain added a proviso: 'except for police purposes in outlying areas,' which meant a free hand to bomb in her Empire. This proviso was not acceptable to others, and so the whole proposal for abolition fell through.

Jawaharlal Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, 1939.

I had the utmost difficulty at that time, amid the public outcry, in preserving the use of the bombing aeroplane.

Lord Londonderry, 1935.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE U.S. ELECTIONS

Herbert Aptheker*

New York, August 29, 1960

THE basic dynamic of life in U.S.A. is the intensifying general crisis afflicting the system of imperialism. The United States is its bastion; here the might of monopoly capitalism is greatest, and the affluence, brazenness and depravity of its rulers are most blatant.

At the same time, here the contradictions reflecting the crisis are most glaring. Among the rich and their servitors, they manifest themselves in a grossness of immorality without equal since the most decadent period of ancient society. Among the middle strata they show themselves in a mounting sense of alienation and loss of purpose without precedent in our U.S. history; mental illness has become epidemic in its proportions, alcoholism and tranquillisation are universal nostrums. In the arts a fantastic corruption permeates the scene. From both strata, and especially from the latter, warnings of disaster are mounting, and even principled protests are appearing. Particularly from growing numbers of artists, professionals, scientists, and assorted intellectuals, expressions of disgust with the utter foulness that dominates their sphere are becoming more and more numerous and vigorous.

From the working masses, significant rumblings and outbursts are appearing, ranging from the heroic four-month-long strike of 500,000 steel-workers in 1959 to the impending strike (as these lines are written) by the workers of the Pennsylvania Railroad—the largest in the country. Mutterings verging on the point of rebellion are coming from the farm belts as the crisis in agriculture deepens with no prospect of solution in the offing. Mr. James F. Patton, President of the National Farmers' Union, re-emphasised the well-known facts again in his letter to the President last April: he pointed out that net farm income was 30 per cent below that of 1953; that farm prices were only 80 per cent of parity, or the break-even point; that the average per capita income on the farm is about half that of the city dweller, and that *one hundred thousand farm families are being forced to leave the land every year.*

Special discontent fills the hearts of the 32,000,000 officially admitted to be 'impoverished', plus—there is considerable overlap—the 25,000,000 'darker folk', Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican-

*Mr. Aptheker, as many of our readers will know, is Editor of *Political Affairs*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American, who suffer not only dire material disadvantage but also barbaric racist persecution.

One of the signs of decay in the social order of U.S.A. is the starving of public services, especially education and health and housing. This is particularly important in helping to explain the 'juvenile delinquency' which a delinquent society has made of fearful proportions. At the same time, it is part of the scandalous neglect of older people, one of the chief symbols of the callousness that marks the dominant 'way of life'.

The newest element here, however, is the rising militancy and popular sweep of the opposition to the decay, injustice, and exploitation. Never in a long history of magnificent struggle have the Negro people been so aroused, so united, and so insistent upon full equality as now. Not since the 1930's has there been so much movement, stirring and debating among youth as there is today—with, once again, the Negro youth showing the way. Never since the Townsend movement in the New Deal days have the aged been so aroused and so effectively organised as they are today. And signs of rank-and-file revolt and pressure in the trade union movement, and among the farming millions, are clear.

Finally, the bankruptcy of official U.S. foreign policy is widely recognised. Note that history shows no other period in which so many people so decisively rejected that official policy—on varying levels of understanding—as is true at this moment. The most dramatic manifestation of this bankruptcy is Cuba; but the U-2, RB-47, Powers' trial, disarmament fiasco, Japanese rejection, Rhee's dismissal, and so on, have all had cumulative effect in persuading many millions of the people that 'something is awfully wrong in Washington'.

The ruling elements, of course, are keenly aware of these developments—however their estimations of them may differ; the most alert among them, like Walter Lippmann, know that they are living in a new era, in which the balance of forces has shifted towards the Socialist world and in which the exceptional circumstances favouring United States capitalism are now ending. Politically, the ruling class is having its troubles, too, with the population at home. The fact is that ever since 1954—when McCarthyism was dealt decisive blows— the electorate of U.S.A. has been moving Left. Whenever voters have had a clear-cut issue, they have chosen the progressive side; whenever they have been faced with a choice between candidates in which one clearly represented reaction and the other at least some protest against

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reaction, they have voted against reaction. (The exceptions, such as Senator Goldwater in Arizona, are exceedingly rare.)

In statistics, the result has been that while the Republican and Democratic Parties each received exactly 49 per cent of the total votes in the 1950 Congressional elections, in 1954 the percentages were 47 and 52, and in 1958 they were 44 and 56 respectively. In terms of office, this means that today the Democrats have 346 members in Congress (Senate and House) to 186 for the Republicans; they control 34 Governorships to 16 for the Republicans; and of the 177 largest cities with elected mayors Democrats number 128 and Republicans 49.

Big business, of course, dominates both political parties. The fact is, however, that ever since Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in particular, its most decisive elements have tended to prefer the Republican Party, while the masses of people—especially the working class and the Negro people—have favoured the Democratic. This, we repeat, does not alter the fact that both parties, throughout, have been instruments, basically, of monopoly capitalism. The Democratic Party, while it has been the vehicle through which the masses have sought to achieve their aims—and partially succeeded in doing so in certain significant areas—has simultaneously been the straitjacket employed by the bourgeoisie to keep the masses bound within the confines of their two-party system.

There is therefore today a great flux in United States politics—and even within the Republican Party there are at times significant struggles between hidebound reactionary and more enlightened liberal positions. The tactic of unity between the Dixiecrat Democrats of the South and the Republican reactionaries in particular has made the two-party system most useful to the monopolists. This tactic, by the way, actually drove the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to consider very seriously in 1944, as Tugwell tells us in his biography, leading a breakaway from the Democratic Party and establishing a new people's party. Increasingly the bourgeoisie seeks to empty the political process of any real content. Hence, the tendency is to choose 'middle-of-the-roaders', or, as the Liberal-Democratic paper *The New York Post* put it (July 20, 1960), to give the electorate 'a choice between two muddle ways'. Naturally, distinctions between parties and their candidates tend to be blurred.

> We give an impression of staging an election which is but a race with one horse, or, one might say, two parties and two candidates split from the same monolithic whole.
>
> C. L. Sulzberger, *New York Times* (July 25, 1960).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LATIN AMERICA, for Indepe

TIPOGRAFIA NACIONAL—GUATEMALA

ARTURO GARCIA BUSTOS

These posters came from Guatemala, before the people's movement there was suppressed by foreign intervention ('Intervencion Extranjera') in 1954. Today they express the mood throughout the Latin American continent.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence and Land Reform

ISMAEL AROCHE

TIPOGRAFIA NACIONAL—GUATEMALA

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In program the Democratic Party does present the more liberal outlook in its labour plank as contrasted with that of the Republican Party. In the decisive areas of civil rights and particularly in peace and disarmament, however, there is little to choose either between the candidates or their party platforms. It is true, nevertheless, that Nixon personally and the Republican Party in general are identified with the worst of McCarthyism and red-baiting and the worst of the Dulles 'liberation', 'massive retaliation' and 'brinkmanship' lunacies; in this sense, as the American people more or less keenly feel, the re-election of a Republican Administration will be viewed by the world as a vote of confidence in a suicidal and bankrupt foreign policy.

This ruling-class policy of camouflage and transparent demagogy, however, has a boomerang tendency. More and more millions of the people became disillusioned about the two-party system; many seek other ways of expressing their needs and demands. Sometimes it means still working within the two-party system, especially the Democratic Party; or working within the party framework whilst setting up independent committees; others, especially the Negro masses, break away from the framework and battle independently in their own organisations.

Increasingly, too, there has been discussion about the need for a new party; most significantly this has come more and more frequently from trade union and Negro leaders. When, for example, the leadership of the AFL-CIO endorsed the candidature of Kennedy-Johnson, there was a notable lack of enthusiasm; only 18 of the 29 members of the General Board even bothered to put in an appearance. A. Philip Randolph, the Negro leader and President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, explicitly withheld endorsement, saying 'there was not enough difference between the candidates', and suggesting the need for a new, labour-based party.

In this situation, the Communist Party refuses to endorse either candidate; it rejects a 'what's the use' attitude; it recognises that the majority of the masses still prefer the Democratic Party and still do not see how to break away from the two-party system. But its main efforts will be devoted to developing independent political action by the masses themselves, where they battle on issues of immediate and overwhelming concern to themselves. The Party believes that the process of disillusionment with the two-party system is well advanced and that it will be pushed forward as the masses themselves learn, through struggle, that they must take

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matters into their own hands, create their own organs, choose their own leaders and implement their own programmes. There are, said the statement adopted by the Party's National Executive Committee on August 14, 1960 (and published in full in *Political Affairs* for September), two primary considerations:

(a) How can we reach, work with, and influence workers, Negroes, farmers, the aged, the youth, liberals, progressives, and the broader 'Left' to enter into determined, persistent mass pressure campaigns—of all kinds, at all levels, from the simplest to the highest forms—for peace, in support of colonial struggles, for civil rights, and for a full range of labour and social legislation; and

(b) How, through these efforts, can we help to further the growth of grass-roots independent political movement, in the first place involving the trade unions, but including such other independent pressure movements as can be developed among all sections of the people.

The real meaning of the 1960 elections is to develop still further the people's confidence in their own strength, to help them see more and more clearly the ruling-class trap that is the two-party system, and so assist in unfolding a true popular ground-swell that will produce a mass party of the trade union movement, the Negro masses, the poorer farmers, the harassed middle class, the distressed professional and intellectual, and the distraught youth.

With such a new party, the grip of monopoly capitalism upon life in U.S.A. will be successfully challenged, a positive outcome to the struggle for peace will be assured, and a splendid life of creativeness and dignity will open up for the hundred and eighty millions of our country.

THEIR TRUE VOICE

Washington has often declared to me that he considered our new Constitution as an experiment on the practicability of Republican Government, and with what dose of liberty man could be trusted for his own good, that he was determined the experiment should have a fair trial, and would lose the last drop of his blood in support of it.

Thomas Jefferson.

The strongest bond of human sympathy, outside of the family relation, should be one uniting all working people, all nations, and tongues, and kindreds.

Abraham Lincoln.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONALISATION OF INSURANCE

Frank Crump

General Secretary of the National Amalgamated Union of Life Assurance Workers

IN considering the case for nationalisation of any industry, it is essential, particularly if its advocates appear to have a sectional interest, to state from what standpoint the desire is motivated. The National Amalgamated Union of Life Assurance Workers have always had a socialist approach: that nationalisation is in the best interests of society as a whole. That the sectional interest of insurance workers would be enhanced in no way detracts from this politically conscious concept.

Insurance divides into two main fields. First there is industrial assurance, collected at people's homes weekly or monthly. Secondly, there are the multifarious forms of insurance on a much larger financial scale, effected by insurance brokers, members of Lloyds and banks. Although the proponents of nationalisation usually envisage the public ownership of all forms as the ultimate goal, the emphasis is generally concentrated on industrial assurance. It is this which has been most criticised, and it is close to the daily lives of the working population.

Nationalisation is advocated because of the widespread social use of the commodity or service and of its importance in Britain's economic life; this is certainly true of industrial assurance. Over ten years ago a survey conducted by the industrial life offices estimated that policies were held in nine out of ten working-class homes. The last Report of the Industrial Assurance Commissioner, referred to the increase in average sum assured per policy:

> Probably the most important factor at work is the increase in the level of wages earned by the classes from which the companies draw most of their support.

One might also say: profits. Industrial assurance ranks as one of the biggest industries. Its financial importance is indicated in the following figures: in 1952 the total annual premium income was £104,000,000 and the total industrial assurance funds £661,000,000. In 1958 these figures rose to £137,000,000 and £905,000,000 respectively. Surely the insurance business is among the 'commanding heights' of our economy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Industrial assurance has been strongly criticised for many years. Official commissions and independent inquiries have followed one after another: never once has the industry been given a clean bill of health.* As far back as 1864 Gladstone was critical of its defects; amongst some later comments are the following:

1874. The Northgate Commission described the system as extravagant and marked by gross abuses.

1909. Winston Churchill, while President of the Board of Trade, introducing the *Assurance Companies Bill,* called it

> a class of business particularly open to abuse. It is a poor man's business. It consists in the process of sinking a lump sum by monthly or weekly payments extending over a long period. In these cases if one payment lapsed the whole premiums previously made are forfeited and some of these societies live almost entirely on that provision. Anything more injurious to the thrift of the people, anything more calculated to discourage saving habits on the part of a large mass of our countrymen one cannot conceive.

1920. The Parmoor Committee stated that the system 'lends itself to abuses in many directions'.

1932. The National Council of Social Service giving evidence before the Cohen Committee stated:

> We really feel that industrial assurance is carried on on such a big scale that it ought to be a public service.

1933. The Cohen Committee came to the conclusion that

> excessive competition with its almost feverish pressure for 'increase' firstly by the offices upon their staffs, and secondly by the latter upon the working class population, is responsible for the principle defects of the business.

1942. The Beveridge Report said amongst its recommendations

> the only satisfactory solution to the problem of industrial assurance, retaining the good while curing the defects of the present system, will be in following out the final hint of the Cohen Committee and converting industrial assurance from being a competitive sellers' business to being a monopoly consumers' service.

No account of criticisms would be complete without quoting a Conservative M.P., the late Sir Arnold Wilson, in his book *Industrial Assurance* (1937):

> The salient characteristic of industrial assurance is the existence of vast aggregations of capital in a very few hands, with unlimited power, exercised in secrecy and uncontrolled by any external agency, to give or withhold financial assistance in any country, at home or abroad, to any industry or trade. Without in any way reflecting on the probity and skill of those who direct this great business—and it is seldom that either

*In 1944 a Tory Reform Committee pamphlet said: 'Every official committee which has investigated industrial assurance in the past has criticised the conduct and results of the business'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one or the other is questioned—it is submitted that under modern conditions they have become a repository of power greater by far than the banks, and less under effective social control. Some limitation of their scope seems desirable in the public interest.

Some abuses have been curtailed by legislation, or through a more responsible attitude by insurance offices themselves. Others, however, are inherent in the system. Lapsing policies shortly after entry is still too high, and is bound to continue when pressure to procure new policies is almost the sole criterion of a successful agent. In 1957 the number of policies forfeited entirely was still alarmingly high: with companies it was 15·2 per cent of all policies written up during the year; with societies, 16·5 per cent. Not only is this a complete loss to the policyholder, but it also reflects the intense pressure on the field staff, and hence on the insuring public, through a soul-destroying high-pressure sales drive, which is indeed intensified now in comparative prosperity and 'full employment'.

The National Amalgamated Union of Life Assurance Workers continuously since 1926 has criticised this wasteful process. Only in recent years has there been support from other insurance workers' organisations, which have frequently been under the domination and patronage of the employers. That this domination still continues was disclosed by Henry Levitt (Guild of Insurance Officials) at the recent Trades Union Congress. Even today the unions are called upon to defend elderly agents with long service who cannot respond to the demand for 'increase' and are being harassed or forced into premature retirement or 'resignation'.

There is hardly a major industry or financial undertaking in which the insurance offices have not a substantial interest. There has never been a need for the introduction of new capital in the insurance companies and yet the issue of bonus shares and watered capital over the years has been colossal. Fortunes are made, frequently for the favoured few, often within the confines of one family. Dividends paid in a number of companies on such inflated capital have for years varied between fifty and a hundred per cent.

Whilst the companies have borne the brunt of criticism, friendly societies have not been immune, although policyholders and employees have tended to regard them more favourably because of a more liberal outlook and the democratic control vested in their members. Up to 1910 or so, this was probably true. But in succeeding years their constitution and articles were so modified by management influence, geographical conditions and the apathy of members, that their democratic nature became more apparent than

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

real. It is not unusual for annual meetings to be composed almost entirely of chief office, clerical and executive staffs (agents are precluded by legislation from attending)—sometimes hand-picked. In societies with delegates locally elected, there still remain vestiges of control by members; but delegates are frequently elected by a minority.

Ever since 1926, nationalisation of insurance has been in the programme of the Labour Party, frequently confirmed by annual conference. Always the Party case has been reinforced by the findings of committees of inquiry, the investigation of private individuals representative even of political opponents, as well as recommendations by sub-committees of the Labour Party. In 1918 the Labour Party was much more radical and proposed the expropriation of private industrial and life assurance companies. Subsequently, however, the approach was much less drastic, although the question of workers' control was for a number of years much canvassed. In 1949, following the Beveridge Report, the Party embraced the idea of taking over industrial insurance as a publicly-owned mutual with ownership vested in the policyholders. This was dictated to some extent by pressure from the co-operative movement in some special pleading on behalf of the Co-operative Insurance Society, which despite its title, is an insurance company, with shares owned jointly by the English and Scottish co-operative societies. Although controlled under the co-operative system of democratic centralism, in its functioning, it is even less democratic than the friendly societies, and in its business operation generally indistinguishable from the companies.

Reading a recent book by an American, Herbert E. Weiner, *British Labour and Public Ownership,* tracing the history of the case for public ownership, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, so far as industrial assurance is concerned, that the leadership has been reluctant to tackle the issue and implement policy. In brief space it is impossible to recapitulate all the facts, figures and criticism which justify the case for nationalisation of industrial assurance as a prime social necessity; but enough has been said to show that some form of public ownership is long overdue.

It is to be hoped that the growing resurgence of radical and socialist thought in the Labour Party will result, following conference discussion of Clause 4 and the nationalisation resolutions, in a policy accepting nationalisation of insurance as a fundamental first step to storming the 'commanding heights' of power.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SEAMEN'S STRUGGLES

George Hardy

MANY aged seamen will still remember the first successful national seamen's strike in 1911, led by the late Havelock Wilson, C.H., C.B.E., who had spent years in building the National Sailors' and Firemen's Union in face of bitter opposition of the shipowners.

By national action, well supported by the dockers and other transport workers, they not only won a wage increase and a national agreement, but also the abolition of the Federation Ticket (a method of blacklist) which all seamen had to possess in order to obtain work. Doubtless shipowners took into consideration the impending war against Germany, in which seamen would play a vital role. Nevertheless, this victory acted as a stimulant to other transport workers, culminating in the fierce struggles in 1912 involving road, rail and sea transport, when infantry, cavalry and armoured vehicles were used to suppress the strikers. Thus, against this background we see Havelock Wilson first played a positive role, having suffered imprisonment for his earlier activity. From then onwards, however, this positive feature was not maintained. Devoid of any democratic control by the membership, more and more he turned the union into an instrument of the shipowners, bureaucratically controlled by himself.

Following the first world war, in which 15,000 British seamen lost their lives, a new opposition union was organised under the leadership of Joe Cotter and Emanuel Shinwell—the Amalgamated Marine Workers' Union. The vested interests of Havelock Wilson were now challenged. The shipowners, always anxious to maintain a control over the seamen, both ashore and afloat, now openly revealed the extent to which he served their interests. With his collaboration they instituted a new form of federation ticket, known as the P.C.5, which to obtain work, could only be got through the union controlled by him. Thus a form of blacklist became operative against militant seamen and members of the A.M.W.U., which was also affiliated to the Trades Union Congress; and the P.C.5 played a major role in its final elimination.

Then came the bitter struggles arising from the strike of German seamen. Reduced to starvation on the collapse of German currency in 1923, they sought the aid of organised workers abroad to tie up vessels overseas. In 1924 the impoverished seamen struck in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foreign ports, including Britain. From the first day of their strike, Havelock Wilson pledged support, but only, as we learned later, to betray them. Instead of a show-down with the German shipowners based on help from the British seamen's union, the German strikers were shipped back to Hamburg, in doing which Wilson played a part. Many were arrested and given prison sentences, whilst German vessels were taken back by the officers.

In these circumstances German competition was made the excuse for an attack on British seamen's wages and conditions. On July 3, 1925, with large numbers of British seamen unemployed, Havelock Wilson, and his silent officials, met the shipowners' representatives, the so-called Maritime Board under the chairmanship of Sir F. Shadwell Watts of the Shipping Federation. Watts said, and I quote from the verbatim report which fell into my hands:

> Speaking for myself and a good many of us, we prefer to just come and ask you—more or less formally—I shall just say that we have come to ask you what you propose to do about it (*a reduction in wages*).

To this Havelock Wilson replied:

> We have come to say to you this morning, we will give up that £1 at once—without any arguments, without any alarming statements about what is going to happen—and I hope, Mr. Chairman, and you gentlemen, will recognise that in doing that, we are doing a manly thing.... It is better for us to suggest a reduction—and we advise you strongly to accept—so we offer you that £1.

This offer amounted to placing £1,500,000 into the pockets of the shipowners annually. Shadwell Watts replied accepting 'this generous offer':

> from the point of view in which it has been made, and also because we think it may be of assistance to us in bringing about other reductions. I wish to thank you for ... what after all, you will understand is a drop in the bucket.

Conscious of the extent of this open betrayal of the seamen, and anticipating their reaction to this treasonable act, Wilson warned of its effect, and said:

> What does it matter to me if a fellow on a ship is cursing me and saying I ought to be shot. I am safely fixed in a place called St. Georges Hall (*the union headquarters*).

Whenever officials of the labour movement enter into treasonable conspiracies, the treachery knows no end: 1925 was a vital year for British trade unionism. The mineowners were feverishly preparing to reduce wages, destroy the seven-hour day and abolish national agreements and the effectiveness of the Miners' Federation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Havelock Wilson knew this. Therefore he asked the shipowners to blacklist militant seamen, again I quote from the report:

> If you were to have a great upheaval in this country and that is possible—supposing you have a miners' strike and you have the railwaymen and dockers coming in—then you would have this gang of men, 'danger men' I call them, throwing in their lot against your side, and your shipping would be reduced to pulp.

Here was the nature of this conspiracy against the whole working class clearly stated.

However, the seamen quickly responded. Mass meetings were called spontaneously. Amongst others I was asked to give them help and guidance. My first mass meeting of the seamen was in Poplar Town Hall. It was packed to over-flowing. Many seamen's wives were present. On the same day a libellous leaflet was issued, charging me with being 'a German spy' during the war. It was handed to me as I entered the platform, and I read it aloud to the seamen. Then I read from the verbatim report quoted above, and asked the audience to judge as to who was the traitor. To the resounding shouts of unprintable language the seamen unanimously condemned Havelock Wilson; and after I had explained the nature of the struggle they were about to enter, they decided for strike action. The response was immediate. Seamen left their ships in South Africa, New Zealand, Australia and other foreign ports. After nine weeks the strike was called off. We did not gain retention of the £1; nonetheless, only after seven years elapsed did the shipowners dare to seek another 'drop in the bucket'.

As Havelock Wilson predicted, the General Strike followed the coalowners' notice of a lockout of the miners. He instructed the seamen to blackleg by refusing to obey the call by the General Council of the T.U.C. But to the credit of large numbers, together with a number of the N.U.S. officials, they joined the General Strike.

The treacherous story does not end here. When nine days later the General Council of the T.U.C. abandoned the miners and called off the General Strike, Havelock Wilson then proceeded to disrupt the miners' union. Together with the Tories he became an advocate of company unionism, of the so-called 'non-political unions'. He actually used union funds to finance a yellow company union, the Spencer Union, in the Notts coalfield. He also tried it in South Wales and other coalfields. This left no alternative but expulsion of the National Union of Seamen from the Trades Union Congress, the decision at long last being endorsed unanimously on Sep-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tember 4, 1928,* at the Swansea T.U.C. Now thoroughly exposed, Havelock Wilson withdrew the seamens' union from affiliation to the Labour Party and from the International Federation of Transport Workers, isolating them nationally and internationally.

There would be no point in repeating this treasonable story unless some lessons were drawn. Of course, Havelock Wilson was not alone. But how could he get away with his treacherous game? Only by denying the membership any effective democratic control over union affairs, enabling himself to exercise a bureaucratic control of all union business. Union representatives and delegates were appointed and could be sacked at will, as were those who supported the General Strike. Seventy per cent of the seamen are always at sea. In troublesome times even branch meetings are denied those in home ports. This is why the long-standing demand for delegates and Committees aboard ships is so important.

MY FIRST STRIKE

Donald McLaren†

WHEN we shipbuilding and engineering apprentices on Clydeside downed tools on Thursday, April 22, 1960, we did not withdraw our labour because the weather was warm and sunny, as some armchair philosophers would so readily tell you. We declared official strike action in pursuit of decent living standards, because there was no other means left by which to increase our mere pittance of a wage. I say now with full conviction, and with the voice of every apprentice behind me, that the full blame for the strike rests entirely with that despicable breed of people, the shipbuilding and engineering employers; it was by their consistent refusal over the past six years, by their vicious victimisation of boys who had demonstrated to bring attention to their wage claim and—most disgusting of all—by sending threatening letters to the boys' parents, trying to enlist parents' help in their low attempts at intimidation. They must accept full responsibility for what has happened and what can happen in the future.

If the employers are slow to learn, we are not. I know we apprentices were learning more and more every day that passed.

*In the chair was Alderman Ben Turner, one of the foremost trade union supporters of 'Mondism'.

†As many of our readers will know, Don McLaren is secretary of the Clydeside Apprentices' Committee.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the first turmoil of thousands of apprentices pouring out from every yard and factory on Clydeside, we in the Clydeside Apprentices' Committee (C.A.C.) settled down to plan a campaign that would ensure ultimate success. Finally we agreed on a line of action round this idea. First stage: 100 per cent apprentices out in Scotland. Second stage: Winning adult support, both financial and militant, first on Clydeside, and then nationally. Third stage: 100 per cent apprentices out in Great Britain. We felt that each stage had to be secured and won, to show the boys that our action was progressing in a logical form, and that we were winning every round. The Committee knew too that contact with the main body of apprentices at all times was essential, as the Tory press by misrepresentation and obscuring the facts would try to create confusion amongst our ranks. They had little success throughout the strike, the tremendous enthusiasm and militancy of the boys in their determination for higher wages cut through all attempts by the press to disunite them.

The solidarity of the lads right from the word 'go' was something to behold. There was a real sense of earnestness about the boys. They took to the maxim 'United we stand, divided we fall' like a duck to water. Very early on, the press wanted 'names'. 'Who's the leader?' 'Are there any Communists on the Committee?', 'Has the Committee or any member of the Committee been in touch with the Communist Party Headquarters?' But we saw through that; and all such attempts met with a firm stubbornness to give them no foothold to divide us.

Another lesson that struck home to me was 'Leaders are born in struggle'. This is certainly true! Anyone who witnessed the development of some of the apprentices' leaders would have been left in no doubt about this. Boys who had never uttered more than three or four consecutive sentences, became budding public speakers holding forth to thousands of apprentices, arguing a direct, forceful and sincere case. They travelled all over Britain, addressing meetings. They appeared on T.V. and organised mass lobbies of trade union conferences, like the Confederation Annual Meeting, as Frank Foulkes described in the August *L.M.* The organisational ability of some of my fellow apprentices was a real surprise. Lads I had known for months, even years, amazed me by the business-like way in which they carried through the job of organising the strike. The Finance Committee handling hundreds of pounds with the ease of Wall Street Bankers. The Propaganda Committee storming Clydeside with their leaflets, whitewashing teams and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

factory-gate meetings, that would have put Labour Party election boys to shame. The Demonstration Committee topped the lot. It is doubtful if Clydeside has ever seen anything as amusingly funny, yet at times so grimly determined, as some of the demonstrations organised before and during the strike.

One thing certainly occurred to me; if most of my companions were half as good at their trade as they were at fighting the bosses, then they deserved double the money that we were asking for!

At this stage there is not really much more to be said. The strike is over and we have been awarded increases ranging from 4s. at 15 years to 16s. at 20 years. Certainly this falls a long way short of what we were fighting for, an average of £2 12s. 6d. per week; but of one thing we are all convinced and that is, had it not been for our determined strike action, we would not have received a penny, far less 16s. There are few boys who do not realise this.

VIEWS OF THE WORLD

A Reminder of Scarborough, 1954

(*On the Labour Party National Executive Committee in* 1957, *and former President of the Amalgamated Union of Foundry Workers, Roland Casasola received an ovation at the Labour Party Conference at Scarborough in* 1954, *when he moved the historic resolution to resist German rearmament.—Ed.*, L.M.)

ONCE MORE the Labour Party Conference is being held at Scarborough, as it was in 1954, when the key question was: Should West Germany be rearmed? I had the honour of moving the composite resolution, No. 22, seconded by Ben Parkin, M.P., which said No! to rearmament, and called instead 'for negotiations at the highest level for a peace treaty that will bring about a united, democratic Germany'. I stated in moving that a rearmed Germany would bring fear of another war in Europe, it would be a move towards war and make further negotiations with the Russians more difficult. Well! we were defeated by only 371,000 votes out of a total of 6,191,000; whilst the E.C.'s resolution was carried by an even smaller margin of 248,000 out of 6,292,000: and if every union delegation had stood by their annual conference decisions, the Labour party six years ago would have gone against German rearmament.

How close that decision was, on that morning of Tuesday, September 28, 1954! As I read statements by the people who opposed us then I wonder how they like the situation now. For it is just what we said it would be. Germany now wants nuclear weapons: Berlin has become the flash point in Europe.

Now once again at Scarborough the Labour Party must make a vital decision—on the unilateral abandonment of all nuclear weapons. The reason we are in this position today in my opinion is because Conference in 1954 made the wrong decision. To delegates at this conference I would say: Don't make the same mistake, for there will be no third

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chance. In a nuclear war this country will be destroyed. The question is whether the human race as we know it is going to inhabit this globe, and move forward in the atomic age to a world of plenty and universal brotherhood—to world socialism.

And I would say to the delegates from the unions: stick to your annual conference and national committee decision. Don't be manoeuvred into a false position. Let it be a warning to you.

The people of the world do not want war. They want real peace, not armed truce. You are in that privileged position, that by your vote on October 5, 1960, you can give the world that lead.

'Come comrades! Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
Swing inward, O gates of the Future!
Swing outward, ye gates of the Past!
For the minds of the people are moving
And rising from slumber at last!'

ROLAND CASASOLA,
Manchester.

Casement, Ireland and Africa

I WRITE to thank you for your tribute to Roger Casement, who did so much to expose the brutality of Belgian imperialism in the Congo before laying down his life in the struggle against British imperialism in his native Ireland.

At the same time I wish to question your statement that he was 'misled in his final desperate attempt to serve the cause of Ireland with the aid of another imperialism'. If he was misled, so were the other leaders of the Easter Week Rising, because German aid was part of their plan. Connolly wrote: 'For our part we take our stand openly upon the fundamental truth that Ireland is a subject nation, and that therefore Ireland has no national enemy in Europe save one, and that one is the nation that holds her in subjection'. (From *The Workers' Republic,* March 25, 1916, quoted in *Labour and Easter Week,* p.165.) This stand taken by the Irish leaders was in line with the Bolshevik policy of turning the imperialist war into a civil war. Moreover, in the year following the Easter Week rising in Ireland, it was with German aid that Lenin got back to Russia in time to lead the October Revolution; and he too was denounced as a German agent. In the second world war, the leaders of the Greek resistance accepted British aid against German imperialism; so did the leaders of the Malayan resistance against Japanese imperialism. We know how the British Government betrayed them after the war was won. Were they, then, misled? Should we not rather say that they were right to strike a blow against imperialism when and where they did, and that it was we who were so far misled that we permitted our own Labour Government to perpetrate those acts of treachery? If the working-class had not made use of the contradictions of imperialism for its own advantage, there would have been no socialist revolution.

It is also wrong, I think, to speak of the Rising as 'desperate'. It was soon crushed, but it left behind a spark that started a prairie fire. It was with good reason therefore, that, when he saw the flag of the Irish Republic flying in the Dublin sunshine on that Monday morning, Jim Connolly turned to Tom Clarke with tears of joy in his eyes and cried: 'Thanks be to God, Tom, that we have lived to see this day!' The truth of the matter was surely stated by Lenin: 'The misfortune of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irish is that they rose prematurely, when the European revolt of the proletariat had not yet matured. Capitalism is not so harmoniously built that the various springs of rebellion can immediately merge into one, of their own accord, without reverses and defeats'. (*Selected Works*, Vol. V, p.306.)

To-day, forty-four years afterwards, the springs have so far merged that the whole of Africa is in revolt, and a new flag is flying in the Congo. There, as in Ireland, the memory of Roger Casement will be honoured for ever.

GEORGE THOMSON,
Birmingham.

(*We welcome warmly the spirit of George Thomson's letter, even though there might be a slight misconception in the criticism. The reference to 'misled' and 'desperate' was not of course to the Easter Rising, the Marxist-Leninist estimate of which is well-known, but to the unhappy conditions in which Casement found himself in the hands of the German militarists who failed to supply him with the arms he had hoped to get and who landed him without arms on the Kerry coast to fall into the hands of the British military authorities—Ed.*, L.M.)

The Great Trains Robbery

THE 1960 Conferences of the National Union of Railwaymen, the Transport Salaried Staff Association and the Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen, have proved the growing awareness of the railmen of their place in society. There was a strong Left-wing sentiment running through all the rail conferences, and it was a welcome sign. World peace, the H-bomb, Clause 4, and *apartheid*, modernisation, exploitation, wages and conditions, nationalisation, these are the subjects which are agitating railwaymen. Their massive strength is vital to the well-being of the labour movement, and a new spirit of unity is manifest amongst them. To democratise their industry, to put it on a real socialist basis, to prove to the British working class that they have truly donned the mantle of the pioneers—that is the future for the railwaymen.

In July 1960, the British Transport Commission laid before Parliament its 1959 balance sheet. Two things were immediately apparent. First, that exploitation of the present labour force and the efficiency of the industry has reached unprecedented levels. Secondly, despite the handicaps of vast compensation payments and the interest on new loans (reaching £85,000,000 annually by 1965), the planners and administrators of the varied undertakings have now proved that a public utility can operate successfully, pay good wages and provide adequate pensions for its staff and still provide a working surplus for modernisation and research.

The 1959 Report showed startling advances in the affairs of the British Transport Commission, both operational and financial, whilst 1960 will show an even higher degree of exploitation of men and machines. Here are some examples. On British Railways, although gross receipts were £14,000,000 less than in 1958, when the big users of metals were charged 3¼d. per ton mile for iron, steel, ore and limestone haulage, working expenses were cut by £20,000,000, leaving working deficit down by £6,000,000. British road services section 1959 net receipts were £3,000,000—an increase of £1,000,000 over 1958; Tilling and Scottish buses made good progress and London Transport Ser-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vice covered both its operating tasks and its share of British Railways central charges. What contributed to this? Greater car mileage, fare increases, reduction in the licensed vehicle duty, together with the B.T.C. being able to depress wages in 1959 (whilst railmen awaited the pay enquiry). For the hotels and catering services, it was the best year since 1948, with a surplus of £410,000. No wonder greedy hands are stretching out demanding that these undertakings should be handed back to 'private enterprise'. The Docks were up by £3,000,000. Total profit of the B.T.C. was £29,000,000, or £9,000,000 more. Compensation payments for 1959 were around £48,000,000. The increased productivity due to greater use of manpower, skilful routing of fully loaded trains, and mechanical improvements, together with work-study and time-and-motion agreements, proved the case for public ownership. The impact of electrification and the diesel engine is astounding. By the end of 1958, some 1000 route miles of railway had been electrified, with another 110 miles added last year and 200 more miles due this year. Diesel railcar services are increasing revenue at a tremendous rate: receipts on the Leeds-Barnsley branch shot up 416 per cent. In a few years 2000 diesel shunting engines will be operating in our marshalling yards; they are one-man driven in nearly every case, so this is a major problem for the footplatemen, whose ranks are fast diminishing, by nearly 50 per cent since 1939. For signalmen, electrically controlled signal boxes mean many fewer. At Carlisle, nine marshalling yards will be replaced by one central yard, handling 260 trains per day by push-button methods.

A long overdue revolution is taking place in British Transport, but it is not making itself felt in the wage packets of the men who are switching over to new machines, new techniques, and new responsibilities. After two years of brooding, the pay enquiry laid its report—a bad egg—before the nation in April, 1960. The Tory back-benchers had plenty to say about inflation occurring if the railmen were paid; but the wages scales were merely the minimum that the Government knew the railmen would accept without recourse to strike action. Thousands of railway workers are still under £9 a week, thousands more under £10.

It has been a story of massive negotiating machinery exhausted, with small results, committees and enquiries galore. First the Cameron Committee, next the Morris Enquiry, then Guillebaud. Now the Parliamentary Select Committee submitting a vast report, while Lord Stedeford (Tube Investments) and his own committee of business men, seeks to break the industry up into 'more viable units' (Shades of the steel de-nationalisation game!). The Select Committee asserted that profitability should be the main target, but would consider subsidising some lines and services retained as 'a social need', even if 'uneconomic'. More out of the railwaymen on profitable lines to bolster up the non-profitable tracks! Why not make the big users of the metals pay an 'economic' price for heavy freight? As for Lord Stedeford's little team and their strategy, the trade union movement will have to watch the bowling. Breaking up the industry into viable units means to railwaymen a return to regional practices and regional competition for traffic.

The negative aspects of nationalisation under capitalism are clear;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but the case for large scale planning and administration of transport has been proved to the hilt. It does not need a plethora of committees to convince railwaymen that public ownership is feasible and workable. It will take more than Select Committees and capitalist rationalisers to divert them from their true aim—real Socialist nationalisation with the workers in control at all levels, responsible to the nation.

FRANK MCKENNA.

Looking for Jobs

DECENT JOBS with a future are a rarity for the increasing numbers of young people leaving school. As each Easter, August and December comes by, the Youth Employment Officers are presented with overwhelming problems, and youth with a 'take it or leave it' choice.

This skeleton in the Tory government's cupboard that has rattled its bones throughout hundreds of column inches of national and local press, and filled pages of Hansard, is the postwar increase in the birth rate which presents industry with an increase of more than fifty per cent in the numbers of school leavers starting work in 1962 compared with the figures for 1957. The Tory attitude is, perhaps, summed up in the words of the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce President, Mr. W. Hope-Collins (July, 1960), when he appealed to unions and employers, 'to co-operate in training them (youth) to the journeyman stage, perhaps on a grant aided basis and on condition that only those willing and ready to emigrate would be trained'. And suppose young people don't choose to accept this beatnik policy of despair from such pillars of capitalist society?

The Carr Committee* in its report *Training for Skill*, 1958, appealed for many more skilled openings in industry to meet the increase in the numbers of young workers. What is the response from employers after two years? Rotary Clubs and the like may display careers exhibitions, but they fail to dish up the goods, to offer jobs with a future. For the *Ministry of Labour Gazette* (June, 1960) disclosed that in 1959 'the number of boys under 18 entering employment rose, compared with 1958 by 9 per cent, but the number of apprentices or learners rose by only 6 per cent'. The increase of boys entering 'other employment' which does not include clerical or professional occupations and means unskilled work, was 54 per cent. As for the girl school-leavers in 1959, only 9 per cent became apprentices (nearly half being hairdressing and manicure) or took jobs that would lead to professional qualifications. Some 35 per cent took clerical jobs, while 56 per cent faced the same old 'other employment'.

The government has had some fifteen years' notice of these problems. It has had its chance to take action. Many trade union conferences over the past three or four years have drawn attention to the gravity of the situation. It is time the Labour movement took up this question of young people's futures as a key question. There has been too much plushy seat talk, and boardroom good manners about it so far. The Labour Party's new pamphlet to be discussed at Conference, *Labour in the Sixties*, states: 'Recruitment of young people must now become the main organisational task of the party'. They should heed

*This sub-committee of the National Joint Advisory Council issued a report entitled *Training for Skill: The Recruitment and Training of Young Workers in Industry*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the article in this journal last month by Mick McGahey on the vote at 18, where he showed how young people have responded to the major political campaigns of the Labour movement.

There are practical steps which the working class movement should fight for *now*. First, to insist upon government action and legislation. Put teeth into the Carr Committee Report by the government compelling industry to take in the extra school-leavers and give them higher quality training. Next there is need for some central organisation with this power of compulsion, working closely with the joint training committees of the TUC and the British Employers' Confederation, to co-ordinate and direct training. It should have power to levy all firms within an industry, to help the smaller firms to provide effective training; local authorities could give a lead in their building departments. The school-leaving age should be raised to sixteen at once. At present, young people have to choose between staying on at school or being apprentices, because the age of entry upon apprenticeship is too inflexible. And is it any longer necessary for most apprenticeships to last for a period of five years? Has not the effect of automation and mechanisation broken down the necessary training periods for many trades?

Britain's youth is angry, not at looking back, but at looking forward into an uncertain future. The might and power of the Labour movement must be thrown on the side of the young workers. Our movement knows the language of our class; its history has taught us the cruel way capitalism exploits its young people. A big increase in the number of young people provides great opportunities. Employers may revel in an opportunity to increase the numbers of unskilled labourers vying with each other for meagre low-paid work. But progressive people see it as an opportunity to recruit to Britain's industry vast thousands of eager new young hands which can provide our country with a skilled force that is second to none.

JOHN DELAHOY,
Kent.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, Verbatim Shorthand, Typing (tapes, etc.), Translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Road, London, N.11. ENT 3324.

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books, pamphlets, Lab. Mvt., Spain, Russia, Comintern. We collect. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6. RIV 6807.

LEFT-WING BOOKS and pamphlets bought. High prices paid. Write: Michael Katanka, 160, Edgwarebury Lane, Edgware, Middlesex.

DOES ANYONE require help indoors or out? Advertiser willing give 30 hrs. weekly for small wage and accommodation, separate preferred. Country (Southern Counties). Box 16.

PUBLICATIONS

NATIONAL GUARDIAN, New York, is the voice of progressive America. Edited by James Aronson. 35s. annually. Order from Collet's, 40, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.

SHOW YOUR OVERSEAS FRIENDS the best in Britain! Send *Labour Monthly* this year. We'll post it for you anywhere in the world for £1 yearly, 10s. half-yearly; or 42s. by air. (U.S.A.: $3; 1st class mail, $4.50; airmail, $7.) Write: 'Subs', 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

MONARCHISTS PLEASE NOTE

The book of Kings is fast closing in the great Bible of humanity.

Ernest Jones, *Northern Star*,
March 4, 1848.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SIEGE OF ST. PANCRAS

[With all the planning of a military operation, over 1,000 police invaded blocks of flats in St. Pancras, London, in the early hours of September 22. Here they engaged in a pitched battle with council tenants, two of whom had barricaded themselves in for 25 days, resisting eviction orders from the Tory council. Men, women and children, some still in pyjamas, rushed from their homes in the neighbourhood to defend their fellow tenants, who were finally dragged out of their homes after a sustained battle, in which many were injured and dozens arrested. Before noon London industrial workers had already come out on protest strike, including railway depots and building sites, from one of which, 300 marched to St. Pancras. So began a new stage in the nation-wide struggles against government rent and housing policy, unprecedented since the Clydeside industrial workers struck in support of the tenants' movement during the 1914-1918 War.

Below we print an article by Don Cook, one of the evicted tenants, written only the day before in his barricaded flat.—Ed., L.M.]

Don Cook

September 21, 1960.

I WRITE this from my barricaded top-floor council flat at Kennistoun House, St. Pancras, where we are reaching the climax of a long struggle against rising rents. As we await the bailiffs in the fourth week of this siege, many hundreds of council tenants are now on full rent strike. Over 500 notices to quit have been issued. In the courtyard below the guard on the gates is maintained by a mass picket, twenty-four hours a day, made up of tenants and local trade unionists, many ex-service men and women. A rocket stands mounted ready to fire an alert which will bring hundreds of neighbours rushing to the defences within minutes from the blocks of council flats and private dwelling houses, whose roofs I am looking down on from behind our barricades.

It seems a good moment to review the campaign, which may be of value to the labour and trade union movement nationally, as the full menace of the Tory Government's Rent Act begins to come home to tens of thousands.

An organisation to combat the 1957 Rent Act had been established earlier under the leadership of John Lawrence, Labour Council Leader up to 1958, which drew together many trade

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unionists, private and council tenants, and members of the Labour and Communist Parties. But lack of national leadership against the Rent Act destroyed its effectiveness. So the first attempt to build a united movement failed. When some councillors were expelled from the Labour Party it caused a shift in power in the council elections and the Tories gained a majority in April, 1959. In July they introduced a Differential Rent Scheme, under which council tenants had to submit to a 'Means Test', and were confronted with big increases. The few existing Tenants' Associations were primarily social clubs, unwilling to give a lead. The first open meeting to oppose the scheme was called by the St. Pancras Trades Council on July 26, 1959.

In August and September a small group of tenants made a determined effort to awaken the others to the harshness and danger of the Rent policy and 33 individual tenants' associations sprang up. They were united through a central committee and became the St. Pancras United Borough Council Tenants' Association. Big demonstrations took place during September to December.

At a conference on November 8, 1959, the enthusiasm and initiative of the tenants struck the imagination of the delegates from trade union branches, the Labour and Communist Parties and other organisations. The support proved the all-round opposition to the Tory scheme. As a result, many resolutions were received by the Council, and later a deputation from the London District Council of the National Union of Railwaymen had a long discussion with the Council Leader. So far, however, the practical opposition came from the tenants themselves. Whilst many Labour Party members firmly supported them, certain others attempted to introduce the fear of 'Communist domination' into the smooth-running of the tenants' organisation. Fortunately this was rejected by the tenants.

When the Rent Scheme began on January 4, 1960, over 1,000 tenants refused to pay the increases, rising to 3,000 in the third week. But when the Council threatened tenants with eviction many began to pay up. It looked as though the tenants' opposition was breaking down.

Then came the turning-point on June 28, when three tenants were sued for possession and arrears. The Secretary of the St. Pancras Tenants presented the case, which won sympathy; and a moral victory was gained over the Council, particularly as the court was favourable to the tenants as the law could allow. This boosted morale tremendously; and when a second round of increases began on July 4, many tenants refused to pay. This time Council threats

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were of no avail. A determined effort was launched to bring in the unions and other organisations. Speakers went to many branches, open-air meetings took place daily. This time it was obvious that the tenants were determined to fight. Resolutions of support, money and speakers poured in; District Committees of five unions went on record in support. The Labour Party, now alert to the possibilities of a real fight, joined in the extending campaign.

Knowing that evictions were just ahead, by the middle of August a new and decidedly unusual committee was formed, called the Action Committee, representing tenants, Labour Party, Communist Party and trade unions. Its role was to organise support and defence of two tenants, myself and Arthur Rowe in another block of Council flats, faced with eviction. Without discord, the representatives of the four groups worked solidly, deliberately and successfully; there had emerged a real united expression of working-class solidarity and organisation. Its effect was obvious; help arrived of every kind—materials, food stores, money—poured in from trade union branches and factories, including my own.* At last the Council were faced with the united labour movement. A great demonstration supported by all organisations took place on E-Day, Eviction Day, August 28. Trade unionists and members of political parties joined the tenants at the barricades and on the picket lines. The painters, railwaymen and several factories declared their intention to strike if the tenants were attacked. Messages of support came from all over Britain: the St. Pancras Rent Struggle was being closely watched by the whole Labour movement. When an alarm was sounded by rocket on Monday, August 29, the response was electrifying; thousands of people poured out to the besieged flats, within minutes the streets all round were jammed.

The lesson was obvious. A mighty movement had emerged from the ranks of the workers to support a cause recognised to be of paramount importance to all. The call had been sounded and the response was there for all to see.

Now we are reaching the climax of the struggle in St. Pancras. But already it is obvious that on a clear issue, the organisations of the workers are prepared, indeed, are eager to join together to repel attack. This class solidarity shines like a beacon of hope for the future.

*Don Cook is an engineering shop steward at Handley Page, the big aircraft works.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PIONEER MARXIST HISTORIAN

Nicholas Hannaford

AS John Milton wrote, books can be 'as lively and as vigorously productive as the fabulous dragon's teeth', which sown overnight, 'may chance to spring up armed men'. A case in point is a book denouncing the lack of statesmanship shown by 'those who are at present ruling the destinies of this country' over Egypt.

> We are afraid, however, that this statesmanship is lacking in both parties, who between them share the political power in present-day England. The hope of the Egyptians, as in the case of most subject races, lies partly with themselves, partly with Europe, and partly with the growing democracy all the world over; and though at present it may look faint, it is nevertheless bound to be realised at one time or another. That this time may come speedily and without cataclysm ought to be the sincerest wish of all honest men and lovers of freedom who have been saddled by the rulers of this country with an heritage of cruelty and shame, much against their will, and certainly without their full knowledge.

These words were written exactly fifty years ago. They concluded a remarkable book, *Egypt's Ruin,* by Theodore Rothstein, published in London in October 1910. The two ruling parties were the Tories and the Liberals. Egypt's hope was to win her independence from Britain and to repair the ravages inflicted by foreign occupation then only twenty-eight years old.

In his introduction to the book, the poet Wilfrid Scawen Blunt—friend of many leading Egyptian nationalists of that time—writes that it was 'undertaken by a mind singularly well adapted to its subject both by its extreme accuracy and by its intimate knowledge of those hidden springs of action which in money interests control the world of affairs in Europe'.

What Blunt did not say was that Theodore Rothstein was a Marxist scholar and that his extreme accuracy and his insight into the real springs of political action were due to his deep understanding of Marxist philosophy and historical materialism. *Egypt's Ruin* is in fact one of the earliest examples of the Marxist approach to the history of imperialism: it described events over a period of forty years with the greatest truth and honesty, it revealed the social forces in action, it showed their inevitable trend and by so doing helped them along their course.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Theodore Rothstein died on August 30, 1953, in the U.S.S.R. An Academician, he was working as an historian and a consultant for postgraduate historical research students within a few days of his death. An exile in England from 1893 to 1920, he applied his personal talent and his Marxist understanding to many of the grave problems of the day: he was a member of the Social Democratic Federation and the British Socialist Party.

His book on Egypt is a devastating indictment of the piratical methods of British imperialism in its heyday. 'The truth set plainly forth in chapter and verse', says Blunt. In other words, a step by step exposure of the gradual spoliation of a weaker country by intrigues and manoeuvres, the military occupation, the looting, the reaction and the terror. His aim? To break the wall of lies and deceit which made it possible for Liberal and Tory Governments to brutalize and to loot in the name of the British people, but also to put events in their historical perspective and to show the way ahead, the inevitable march of the Egyptian people towards independence.

Had it reached a wide circulation the book would indeed have opened many eyes. Quietly but effectively, the powers of the day withdrew from circulation as many copies as they could lay hands on, and only a few copies of the only English edition exist today. But banned Marxist writings have their own way of keeping alive. *Egypt's Ruin* has served as a text-book and inspiration to later Marxist writers in this country (and notably Elinor Burns, whose study of *British Imperialism in Egypt* was published in 1928), in the U.S.S.R. and other Socialist countries. A second Russian edition appeared in the U.S.S.R. last January. It has also been studied by the new Arab generation as an important contribution to the understanding of Egypt's history of 50 years ago. If any justification were needed for this small tribute, this in itself would be enough.

BOOKS

Out of Apathy

Edited by E. P. Thompson

Stevens & Sons. 308 pp. 15s.

THIS VOLUME is the first of a series of books to be published by the 'New Left Review' group. It is difficult to see to whom it is addressed, except a vague audience of uncommitted intellectuals. But, we are told in the preface, 'this is not an academic series... We write for the entire Labour movement'. It is permissible to doubt whether the 'entire Labour movement' would make much of the essays in this volume, even if it were interested in reading them, written as they are in a peculiar jargon compounded of the Angry Young

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Men school style and the American-type sociology which is all the rage.

The thesis of this volume is that Britain is 'over-ripe' for socialism, that is, 'the point of maturity has been passed and processes of decay have set in. Apathy is the form this decay takes in our public life'. Various aspects of this situation, political, economic, literary and philosophical, are discussed by the contributors. The essential points could have been made in a third of the length. As it stands, the overwhelming impression it leaves is of a torrent of words (the editor appropriates more than a quarter of the volume). In this space it succeeds in creating a general left-wing atmosphere of dissatisfaction with mid-20th century British capitalism, as well as a distrust of the achievements of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries (some of the contributors even seem to *fear* these achievements where they are most undeniable), and an arrogant sense of the futility of any *organised* political action to bring about a change in the situation. Some of the analyses, e.g., R. Samuel on the structure of big business, and A. Macintyre on contemporary sociological theories, make interesting points. Others, such as P. Worsley's on 'Imperial Retreat', in which a distinction between 'old' and 'new' imperialisms (where 'new' imperialism means no more than 'economic imperialism') is produced as a theoretical distinction of great importance, are simply misleading.

Few of the articles reach any positive, helpful, or remotely practical conclusions. To do so, however, does not seem to be the purpose the group has set itself. On page 306 of a 308-page volume, the editor writes: 'And *how* is this [the building of socialism] to be done? At this point a new volume should begin'. On the evidence of the present work, this should not prove at all difficult, but those who expect any concrete discussion of the way forward from the present situation of a renewed Tory offensive on the working-class movement and of right-wing Labour betrayal, must look elsewhere (the pages of *Labour Monthly* and *Marxism Today*, say).

Nor are intellectuals offered much comfort. A. Macintyre concludes a long and specialised article with the words: 'Two images have been with me throughout the writing of this essay. Between them they seem to show the alternative paths for the intellectual. The one is of J. M. Keynes, the other of Leon Trotsky. ... I think of them at the end, Keynes with his peerage, Trotsky with an ice-pick in his skull. They are the twin lives between which intellectual choice in our society lies'. This is not much of a prospect to offer to the intellectual, uncommitted but still breathing.

This kind of thing is symptomatic of the total absence of anything positive or optimistic in this volume, and indeed, in the 'New Left' position. The generation of a vaguely anti-capitalist frame of mind is about all that it achieves, and this, in the face of its ambitious claims, is hopelessly inadequate. In so far as this volume encourages intellectuals to think that this type of shoddy thinking and sloppy writing is all that is involved in political awareness and commitment, and in so far as it leads the labour movement to believe that intellectuals are capable only of inconclusive and interminable discussions divorced from the realities of political struggle, it is a positive disservice both to progressive intellectuals and to the Labour movement.

D. NANDY.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page ii of cover)

A *Kent reader*, celebrating 'my first year with you', calls *L.M.* 'a treasure house of Socialist analytical information. It should reach every working-class home instead of the heavily biassed BBC newscasters, or the stupid *Daily Mirror*. What a mine of information!' Another new reader from *Durham*, writing for information about Jomo Kenyatta and the history of the struggle in Kenya says: 'How I wish I'd known of *L.M.*'s existence before!' Of course, it has been good to see a number of miners' lodges increasing their order or starting a regular one; and I hope to hear from many trade union branches as our new and most important series on *Trade Union Problems Today* gets under way next month. Here readers can help; first, by making the series widely known and getting their organisations to put in a regular order for it. Secondly, when such problems are being discussed to send in comments and contributions to *Views of the World*. And thirdly, to make sure it gets proper attention in trade union branches when it comes up. On request we will always circularise an organisation with information about it; but we have not the money to do this widely without making sure that what we do send out does not get passed over when the item 'Correspondence' comes up by secretaries struggling through a heavy agenda. So co-operation and advice from readers on this point would be a great help and money-saver.

Lack of money is a severe limitation on what we can do. Take this question of circularising news of a vitally important article or series. It costs us nearly £18 *in postage alone* to send out to only 2,000 organisations—which would scarcely cover the Amalgamated Engineering Union branches, let alone factory committees, the miners, builders, railwaymen. To send an *L.M.* representative to the Labour Party Conference at Scarborough can't be done under £15, however narrowly we watch expenses. But the fund, despite the devotion of the regulars is not keeping pace with the opportunities we have of expanding. So we must ask more to follow the example of readers who express appreciation of the magazine by giving what they can—and collecting. Many thanks to those who during holidays have been amongst the missing, and are now catching up. As *'Backslider'* writes: 'That fund! what a headache! Herewith an "Aspro"'—his headache cure amounted to 10s. August donations totalled:

£51 2s. 7d.

REGULAR DONATIONS come from: M. Philibert, 10s; H.G.B., 5s; H. Brindle, 5s; C.T.H., £7; R. McLeod, 2s 6d; J. A. Smith, 12s; E. Strachan Rogers, £1 1s; B. Ainley, 10s; C.T.M., 19s 6d; 'Backslider', 10s; Royston Green, 3s 6d; R.F.B., £3; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s; Oliver Twist and Friends, 10s; L. Bates, 1s 4d; Blackburn Branch, 3s; Oldham Branch, 1s; The Humphreys Family, 5s; 'L'Humanité', 4s; S. Morrissy, 10s; C.T.M. (Penny in the £), 4s 1d; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; M. Brandt, 10s 6d; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; Socialist Sailor, £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: J. H. Wood, 10s; G.P. (Canada), 14s 10d; Anon, £4; J. A. P. Hall, 2s; M. Whelen, £1; T. D. Tyson, 12s; J. McLeod, £1; L. Goldman, £1; W.V.S. (Canada), 7s 2d; E. N. Walker, 2s; R. Bridgeman, 11s; A. Perkins, 12s; R. Dodd, £10; A. W. Elliott, 3s 6d; W. Harmer, 2s 6d; V. S. Truelove, 12s; M. Darby, 2s; M. Herring, 2s 6d; J. McCabe, 2s; A. E. Moffet, 10s; G. A. Wheelan, 10s; B. J. Clifton, £1; J. E. Summer, 2s; F. W. Garley, 12s; G. Mearns, 12s; W. H. Laithwaite, £2; T. Foran, 10s; K.N. (U.S.A.), £3 11s 2d.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. No. L.99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Invisible Spectacles

For particulars of

CONTACT & MICRO-CORNEAL LENSES

Write, phone or call at

8 Archway Road,
Highgate, N.19.
(*Opposite Archway Underground*)
Phone: ARChway 1506

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating by craftsmen

STAmford Hill 4096

LABOUR RESEARCH

Strikers and Contempt of Court
Rents and Property Companies
price 1s. 2d. post free
Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

Lytton Bros. Ltd.

We stock top quality men's wear at reasonable prices.

Call when in town, mentioning Labour Monthly.

11 Marchmont Street,
London, W.C.1

TERminus 4058

by Russell Square Tube Station

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope), for year's subscription from the.....issue

(SIGNED).....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED